



SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

VICTOR HOLANDA, AICP
DIRECTOR

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2005
TO: SUBDIVISION REVIEW BOARD
FROM: ELIZABETH KAVANAUGH, INLAND PLANNER
RE: Denial Findings for Parcel Map CO 04-0375 Using a Transfer
Development Credit - Continued From July 12, 2005.

SUMMARY

The Subdivision Review Board conducted a public hearing for this proposed project on July 12, 2005. Your Board took a tentative action to deny the application. You directed staff to return on this date with findings for denial of the tentative map. These proposed findings are attached to this memorandum as Exhibit A.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the attached findings denying the subject tentative parcel map.

**EXHIBIT A
DENIAL FINDINGS
PARCEL MAP CO 04-0375**

- A. The proposed map is inconsistent with applicable county general and specific plans because it does not comply with General Goal 8 of Framework for Planning that states that a distinction between urban and rural development should be maintained to enhance the pattern of identifiable communities. The proposed subdivision is located between the city of Atascadero and the community of Garden Farms. The existing larger lots of this area create separation between these two communities. The proposed subdivision will erode this separation between these communities because it creates one acre and 1.2 acre parcels that are similar to parcels sizes within these communities.
- C. The proposed map is inconsistent with applicable county general and specific plans because General Goal 9 of Framework for Planning because it would erode the rural character of this area between the city of Atascadero and the community of Garden Farms by allowing for lot sizes that are consistent with the Residential Suburban land use category found in urban and village areas.
- D. The proposed map is not consistent with the county zoning and subdivision ordinances because although the parcel map may technically meet the criteria to be a receiving site, it doesn't meet the "intent" of Chapter 22.24 (TDC Ordinance) as the intent of the ordinance is to send development to more suitable areas and this site is not more suitable because it is an already substandard in size (below the 2.5 acre minimum parcel size set by planning area standard) and would create a parcel with building sites that are only on sloping portions of the lot.
- E. The site is not physically suitable for the type of development allowed by the Residential Suburban land use category, as the proposed parcels are too small to support the keeping of animals that is typical for this area. The proposed subdivision creates a parcel that will be less than one acre net which is too small to keep animals such as horses, goats, and sheep.
- F. The site is not physically suitable because the site cannot adequately support one primary residence on each lot without grading the portion of the site that is sloping.
- G. The proposed parcels are smaller than the surrounding parcels in the area, making the proposed parcels inconsistent with the pattern of development of the area.
- H. That this project is found to be statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the provisions of Public Resources Code section 21080(b)(5), which provides that CEQA does not apply to projects which the public agency rejects or disapproves.